

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-14, 17, and 18 are pending. All claims are rejected. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the following.

**Farone**

Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 11, 13, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Farone et al., U.S. 4,868,365. Applicant flatly traverses this rejection on multiple grounds and requests that it be withdrawn.

First, the claims require that the first wall part be laser welded to the second wall part from the side of the second wall part that is opposite the first wall part (“from an, in the circumferential direction, opposite side of the second wall part in relation to the first wall part”). In Farone, in contrast, the blades 34 (what the Examiner construes as constituting the claim-recited curved first wall part) are welded to the housing 30 (what the Examiner construes as constituting the second wall part having a flat side to which the first wall parts are welded) from the same side of the housing as on which the blades 34 are positioned. See Figure 4 (excerpted from Figure 3 as indicated in Figure 3) and the associated discussion at column 4, lines 54-65 of Farone. (The word “opposite” in that discussion is referring to the side of the blade 34/tab 68 on which the laser is positioned; it is not referring to the side of the housing on which it is positioned.)

Second, the blades 34 and housing 30 in Farone (the alleged first and second wall parts) bear none of the claim-recited geometric properties. The claims specify that an edge of the first wall part bears against a flat side of the second wall part; in Farone, the highly convexly curved outer edges of the blades 34 bear against the highly concavely curved inner surface of the housing 30. The claims specify that the first wall part extends and curves in the eventual circumferential direction of the overall component; in Farone, the blades curve around the toroidal center 28, but with respect to the overall component, they are generally axially aligned.

Third, the claims are specifically directed to a method of manufacturing a gas flow-conducting component. Farone, in contrast, is directed to an automotive torque converter, which does not conduct or direct the flow of gas. More specifically in this regard, the claims specify

that a sufficient number of stator/rotor portions are so constructed and arranged that the first wall parts define “an axially extending, substantially annular flow-guiding surface that delimits a gas duct in [the] eventual radial direction.” In other words, the first wall parts form (i.e., delimit) radially inner and/or radially outer surfaces of the annular gas duct. Farone does not disclose such a gas flow duct. Assuming (since the Examiner does nothing more than quote claim language and refer generally to Farone Figure 4) the Examiner is referring to the toroidal “hole” with center 28, Applicant notes that that “conduit” extends circumferentially around the torque converter and that it is filled with hydraulic fluid. Thus, it is not an axially extending, gas flow-duct delimited by surfaces of the wall parts as required by the claims.

Accordingly, Farone does **not** anticipate the claimed invention, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Farone. Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the reasons set forth above and requests that it be withdrawn.

### **Havard**

Claims 1, 10, 11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Havard et al., U.S. 5,483,034. Applicant flatly traverses this rejection on multiple grounds as well and requests that it be withdrawn.

First, the Examiner asserts that “[t]he spacing between walls 3, 2, 1 are considered gas ducts.” That is not correct. In this regard, Applicant notes that the structure disclosed in Havard is a turbojet duct arm.<sup>1</sup> See Havard’s Abstract; description of prior art; and disclosure at column 2, lines 28-41. Such arms are generally used to support the core of a jet engine within the outer envelope of the engine. They also stiffen the engine structure and are exteriorly shaped to guide the gas flowing past them. See *id.* The edge 4 of the structure shown in Havard Figure 1 is the leading edge of the arm, and the edge 5 is the trailing edge of the arm, and the upper and lower plate surfaces are shaped to guide the flow of gas from the leading edge to the trailing edge of

---

<sup>1</sup> In the previous Response, Applicant asserted that Havard discloses stator or rotor vanes. Applicant was incorrect.

the arm. See column 2, lines 35-41. Thus, gas flows around the structure shown in Havard Figure 1; it does not flow through it, as the Examiner contends.

Second, the structure in Havard does not bear the proper claim-recited geometry. When Havard is properly understood, it should be seen that the partitions 2 extend radially – not circumferentially – within the turbojet structure.

Third, there is absolutely no disclosure whatsoever – because Havard is not, in fact, so used – of multiple structures as disclosed in Havard being assembled to form an “axially extending, substantially annular flow-guiding surface” as required by the claims.

In short, Havard does **not** anticipate the claimed invention, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance, and timely Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

\*\*\*\*\*

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, referencing Attorney Docket No.: 7589.049.NPUS01.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner may directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Novak Druce + Quigg LLP  
1000 Louisiana, Fifty-Third Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(713) 571-3400  
(713) 456-2836 (fax)  
[tracy.druce@novakdruce.com](mailto:tracy.druce@novakdruce.com)

Respectfully submitted,  
  
/Tracy W. Druce/  
  
Tracy W. Druce, Esq.  
Reg. No. 35,493